DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 848 FL 800 860

AUTHOR	Weinstein-Shr, Gail
TITLE	Family and Intergenerational Literacy in Multilingual Families ERIC Q & A. [Revised.]
INSTITUTION	Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Feb 92
CONTRACT	RI89166001
NOTE	6p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ERIC/NCLE, 1118 22nd Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses - ERIC Clearinghouse Products (071)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Acculturation; Competency Based Education; Cooperation; Cultural Background; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Guides; *English (Second Language); Ethnography; Immigrants; *Intergenerational Programs; *Literacy Education; Multilingualism; Parent Child Relationship; Parent Participation; Parent School Relationship; Reading Aloud to Others; Story Telling; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Family Literacy; *Intergenerational Relationship; Promising Practices

ABSTRACT

Five questions and answers are presented in this document. They are as follows: (1) Are family literacy and intergenerational literacy the same? The first term, it is explained, focuses on the parent and child, while the second term, used in the broader sense, involves other adults such as grandparents and neighbors, etc. (2) What are the goals of family and intergenerational programs, and what are some models for working toward those goals? Answer: The goals of both types of programs include: promoting parental involvement; improving attitudes and values as well as skills linked to reading; increasing families' sense of the wider social significance of reading; and addressing the unique difficulties of multilingual families that have been uprooted and displaced. (3) What instructional approaches, methods and techniques are used in family literacy programs? The answer provides two approaches. The are: the competency-based method; and the participatory approach. It is noted that several programs, including Even Start, of Washington state, combine both approaches. (4) What materials and resources have been developed for family and intergenerational programs? Different types of curriculum that will address particular concerns are described in the answer. (5) what are some promising directions for the future? The answer describes four characteristics that all promising programs appear to have in common. Such programs: build on family strengths; see collaboration between child and adult educators as crucial; value traditional culture; and conduct ethnographic research. (Contains 28 references.) (Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education) (LR)

ED 378 848

ERIC Q&A
National Clearinghouse on Literacy Education

Family and Intergenerational Literacy in Multilingual Families

By Gail Weinstein-Shr
Temple University/University of Massachusetts

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

FL 238 862

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC Q&A

August 1990
revised February 1992

National Clearinghouse on Literacy Education

Family and Intergenerational Literacy in Multilingual Families

by Gail Weinstein-Shr,
Temple University/University of Massachusetts

Over the last decade, the view of literacy as a specific set of coding and decoding skills has shifted toward a view of literacy as a set of practices that are shaped by and given meaning through the social context in which they occur. One result is a growing concern for ways in which families affect and create the conditions for literacy development and use.

Are family literacy and intergenerational literacy the same?

The terms family and intergenerational literacy are recent and are used in different ways by different people. However, they share a common recognition that the relationships between children and adults are important, and that these relationships affect literacy use and development.

The initial thrust for family and intergenerational programs grew from experience and research showing that parents' skills and practices influence the school achievement of their children (e.g., Teale, 1982; Sticht & McDonald, 1989). The terms "intergenerational literacy" and "family literacy" have been used both to describe *what is happening* with literacy in the lives of children and adults and to describe the *kinds of programs* designed to strengthen literacy resources by involving at least two generations.

The primary purpose of family literacy programs has been to support parents in promoting the school achievement of their children. To this end, a number of family literacy program initiatives have emerged such as the Barbara Bush Family Literacy Foundation; the Even Start legislation, which provides funding to projects that help parents who desire more educational skills to make sure their children reach their full potential as learners; and the Family English Literacy Program of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, which provides funding to family literacy programs around the country.

Intergenerational literacy is used in a broader sense; besides parents and children, other adults such as grandparents, neighbors, nonparental guardians, and volunteers who will form new relationships with young people may be involved.

What are the goals of family and intergenerational programs, and what are some models for working toward those goals?

One set of goals for family and intergenerational programs has been improving the school achievement of children by promoting parental involvement. Programs aimed primarily at increasing parental involvement use activities that encourage or teach parents: 1) to provide a home environment that supports children's learning needs; 2) to volunteer in schools as aides or in other roles; 3) to monitor children's progress and communicate with school personnel; and 4) to tutor children at home to reinforce work done in school (Simich-Dudgeon, 1986).

A second set of goals in family literacy programs is "... to improve skills, attitudes, values and behaviors linked to reading" (Nickse, 1990, p. 5). Models that aim at these goals use a variety of reading activities. Some of these may involve teaching parents to imitate behaviors that occur in the homes of "successful" readers, such as reading aloud to children or asking children specific types of questions as the parents read. Parents of young children may practice in adult groups using books that they may then read to their children.

Because experience has shown that nonnative-English-speaking parents are rarely in a position to know more English than their children, and thus to read comfortably to them in their newly developing language, some programs reverse this process and have the children read to their parents. Fortunately, research indicates that this is of equal benefit to children (Tizard, Schofield, & Hewison, 1982). Innovative programs such as the Navajo Parent Child Reading Program (Viola, Gray, & Murphy, 1986) or the Pajaro Valley program for Latino families (Ada, 1988) aim to foster a love of literature through a variety of activities, such as storytelling in the native language and in English, with discussions taking place in the native language and in English.

A third set of goals put forth for some programs is to "increase the social significance of literacy in family life by incorporating community cultural forms and social issues into the content of literacy activities" (Auerbach, 1989, p. 17). Models for family and intergenerational literacy that address themselves to these goals will be constituted by activities that "address family and community concerns," that attend to the role of home language and culture, and that include activities to enable adults to develop a critical understanding of schooling to "evaluate and rehearse appropriate responses and develop networks for individual or group advocacy" (Auerbach, 1992).

Finally, some programs specifically address the unique difficulties of uprooted families who are making a life in a new setting. In addition to the stresses of voluntary or involuntary resettlement, multilingual families' difficulties are often exacerbated by the differences in the pace of language acquisition for the different generations. Children who have more exposure to English are often placed in a position of translating and solving other problems for parents, reversing traditional roles and creating

additional stress for all involved. In programs like Project LEIF (Learning English through Intergenerational Friendship), language and literacy are seen as tools that can be used for healing rather than dividing the generations (Weinstein-Shr, 1989).

What instructional approaches, methods and techniques are used in family literacy programs?

In her overview of family literacy programs, Nickse (1989) creates a framework for classifying programs according to the type of participant (Do both adults and children participate? Is one or the other the intended beneficiary?) and the type of intervention (classes for adults? classes with children and adults together? some combination?). The goals of the program will determine both the participants and the type of intervention that is selected.

Many programs for multilingual families focus on the needs of adults. Those programs that aim primarily at increased parental involvement in schooling often draw on competency-based curricula for adults, designed specifically for enabling parents to respond to school expectations. Content might include specific lessons on how to read report cards, talk to a teacher, understand the structure of the school, or help with homework. These programs may also include information about American views of health and nutrition or parenting skills, as well as other competencies that have been identified as useful for members of a particular community.

A second approach, also aimed primarily at adults, is the notion of "participatory curriculum" in which the students themselves determine the direction and thus the content of their classes (see Auerbach, 1992). Problem-posing, a technique in which community issues are addressed collaboratively, assumes that the teacher is a facilitator who does not have the answers but can help to identify resources for solutions that students themselves come up with.

Several programs have combined these approaches. The Even Start program in Washington state, for example, begins with an extensive assessment and analysis of learner needs upon which a participatory curriculum is developed; competency-based materials are available if a particular group of learners articulates a desire for that approach (Griffin, 1990). Other programs begin with structured materials and allow these to lead into discussion and exploration of participants' own perspectives and issues. Wherever the emphasis is placed, it seems that programs that are most successful in introducing information about American cultural values and practices are ones that acknowledge and explore native values and practices as an essential part of the curriculum.

What materials and resources have been developed for family and intergenerational literacy programs?

Curriculum guides for family and intergenerational literacy programs are beginning to emerge from the numerous projects now in operation. While many programs have developed materials to use with their own students, few have had the time or resources to compile these materials into a published format. However, as family and intergenerational literacy programs continue to receive funding over extended periods of time, the volume of documentation will increase. In the interim, a few curriculum guides are currently available.

One competency-based curriculum resource is *Home English Literacy for Parents: An ESL Literacy Curriculum* (Terdy & Berkovitz, 1989), developed by the Home English Literacy for Parents Project (H.E.L.P.) at the Northwest Educational Cooperative in Des Plaines, IL. This guide integrates commonly used adult survival competencies, such as paying bills and reporting an emergency by telephone, with school-related competencies, such as parents reading a child's school schedule and filling out forms. Incorporated into every lesson are questions directed to parents to elicit discussion about school, health, and community issues.

One example of a curriculum that focuses on parenting skills for English language learners is *Parenting Curriculum for Language Minority Parents*. This guide for literate and nonliterate adults was developed in 1988 by the Sacramento-Stockton Family English Literacy Project at California State University, Sacramento (Holt, 1988). Units include health, safety, nutrition, citizenship, education, and parenting.

A participatory approach to curriculum development is illustrated by *Making Meaning, Making Change: Participatory Curriculum Development for Adult ESL/Literacy* (Auerbach, 1992) developed by the English Family Literacy Project at the University of Massachusetts. This approach is based on the tenet that a curriculum that reflects the social and cultural realities of the students has the most relevance and is therefore the most motivating to students. In accordance with this perspective, *Making Meaning, Making Change* is intended as a curriculum guide that may be used as a base upon which to build a curriculum that incorporates students' family situations, language and literacy backgrounds, and cultural strengths. *Talking Shop: A Curriculum Sourcebook for Participatory Adult ESL* (Nash, Rhum, McGrail, & Gomez-Sanford, 1992) is a companion volume to *Making Meaning*. A collection of "windows on the classroom," *Talking Shop* offers accounts of classroom practices from the practitioner's perspective and is divided into three sections. Section one, "Immigrant Experiences," contains units on immigration, sexism, and traffic tickets. Section two, "Mothers and Their Children," is comprised of themes on parents and schools, parents helping their children, and teaching parents and children together. "Redefining Learning and Teaching," section three, includes units on process writing, two-way bilingualism, and group dynamics.

While the work of others can be helpful as a guide, anyone setting up a family or intergenerational literacy program must identify the issues that are of concern to members of their own communities, and adapt or create materials that will address those particular concerns.

What are some promising directions for the future?

The most promising trend is the growing recognition that there is more to family literacy than achievement of children in school. Indeed, a larger, more inclusive picture suggests that it is important to look at children and adults in their families and in their communities as well as in classrooms. Programs that aim to strengthen families and communities while promoting school achievement do not locate "the problem" with parents, but rather see the task as a reciprocal one of enabling parents to understand schools while enabling school personnel to understand and take into account the realities of parents for whom English is not a native language.

Programs that aim to strengthen families and communities while developing literacy resources are likely to be as diverse as the communities they serve. However, there are certain characteristics that repeatedly arise in promising programs.

1. The program builds on family strengths.

Recent studies have indicated that even "at-risk" families have enormous resources for survival and for supporting their children that largely go unrecognized (e.g., Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988). As Ranard (1989) points out, "an approach that views the family—both adults and children—as a combined resource for learning is particularly well suited to the cultural backgrounds and social circumstances of refugee families [who see] the family rather than the individual as the basic unit of society" (p. 1). When the family is viewed as a resource, not as a problem or an obstacle, some approaches become more appropriate than others.

2. Collaboration is crucial.

Family literacy programs are strongest when they involve the creative imagination and joint effort of childhood and adult educators. Project CLASS in Atlanta, Georgia, is an example of one such effort, where children and adults work separately in their own classes and then join one another for collaboratively planned intergenerational activities. Institutions that traditionally serve youth and those that traditionally serve adults have much to offer and teach one another. Programs that are responsive to community needs must also have the collaboration of ethnic community leaders and adult members in each step of program planning and implementation.

3. Value is placed on traditional culture as well as on the new language and culture.

Children who understand their own background and culture are more likely to have the self-esteem needed to acquire a second language and culture. Adults whose knowledge and wisdom is valued are in a better position to support their children in school and elsewhere; they are also in a better position to be helped by their children without having their dignity or their role as parent threatened. Programs that incorporate oral history and exploration of native language and culture as part of the curriculum create a strong base for adding new cultural information and values while strengthening families and communities.

4. Ethnographic research is conducted.

The functions and uses of language and literacy in specific communities are of growing interest to many educational researchers (e.g., Heath, 1983). These can also become the concern of children and adults who can examine their own language and literacy use as part of the educational process. By making explicit what *is*, programs make it possible for individuals to imagine what *might be*.

With recognition of the strengths that multilingual families bring to programs, with collaborative work, with attention to traditional forms of knowledge, and with deliberate investigation of literacy and its uses, it becomes possible to imagine schools that understand and respond to families and communities; families that cooperate with schools toward agreed-upon goals; and generations who find in one another the resources to remember their past and to take on their present and future with confidence and joy.

References

Ada, A.F. (1988). The Pajaro Valley experience: Working with Spanish-speaking parents to develop children's reading and writing skills in the home through the use of children's literature. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Auerbach, E.R. (1992). *Making meaning, making change: Participatory curriculum development for adult ESL/literacy*. McHenry, IL and Washington, DC: Delta Systems and Center for Applied Linguistics.

Auerbach, E.R. (1989). Toward a social-contextual approach to family literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 59*(2): 165-181. (ERIC Journal No. EJ 393 180)

Griffin, S., & Weinstein-Shr, G. (1990). *Family literacy programs: What makes them work*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of TESOL, San Francisco, CA.

Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with words*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Holt, G.D. (1988). *Parenting curriculum for language minority parents*. Sacramento-Stockton Family English Literacy Project, Cross Cultural Resource Center, California State University, Sacramento. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 318 281)

Nash, A., Rhum, M., McGrail, L., & Gomez-Sanford, R. (1992). *Talking shop: A curriculum sourcebook for participatory adult ESL*. McHenry, IL and Washington, DC: Delta Systems and Center for Applied Linguistics.

Nickse, R. (1990). Forward. In M. McIvor (Ed.), *Family literacy in action: A survey of successful programs*. Syracuse, NY: New Readers Press.

Nickse, R. (1989). *The noises of literacy: An overview of intergenerational and family literacy programs*. Report commissioned by the Office of the Secretary of Education, Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 308 415)

Ranard, D.A. (1989). Family literacy: Trends and practices. *In America: Perspectives on Refugee Resettlement*, 7,1-4. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 574)

Simich-Dudgeon, C. (1986). *Parent involvement and the education of limited-English-proficient students. ERIC Digest*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 279 205)

Sticht, T.G., & McDonald, B.A. (1989). *Making the nation smarter: The intergenerational transfer of cognitive ability*. San Diego, CA: Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 309 279)

Taylor, D., & Dorsey-Gaines, C. (1988). *Growing up literate: Learning from inner-city families*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Teale, W. H. (1982). Reading to young children: Its significance for literacy development. In H. Goelman, A. Oberg, & F. Smith, (Eds.), *Awakening to literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Terdy, D., & Berkovitz, L. (1989). *Home English literacy for parents: An ESL family literacy curriculum*. Des Plaines, IL: Northwest Educational Cooperative. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 313 926)

Tizard, J., Schofield, W., & Hewison, J. (1982). Symposium: Reading collaboration between teachers and parents in assisting children's reading. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 52.

Viola, M., Gray, A., & Murphy, B. (1986). *Report on the Navajo*

parent child reading program at the Chinle Primary School. Chinle School District, AZ.

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1989, October). Breaking the linguistic and social isolation of refugee elders. *TESOL Newsletter*, p. 9.

For Further Reading

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework.* Los Angeles: California State University.

Delgado-Gaitán, C. (1987). Mexican adult literacy: New directions for immigrants. In S.R. Goldman & H.Trueba (Eds.), *Becoming literate in English as a second language.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

García, D. C. (Ed.). (1988). Promoting adult learning: Approaches to literacy, ESL and parental involvement. *Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium of the Family English Literacy Program.* Miami, FL: Florida International University.

Harvard Family Research Project. (1989). *Innovative states: Emerging family support and education programs.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 792)

Nash, A. (Ed.). (1987). *English family literacy: An annotated bibliography.* Boston: University of Massachusetts, English Family Literacy Project. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 795)

Olsen, L., & Dowell, C. (1989). *Bridges: Promising programs for the education of immigrant children.* A publication of the California Tomorrow Immigrant Students project. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314 544)

Quinteró, E. (Comp.). (1987). *Intergenerational literacy model project handbook.* El Paso, TX: Texas Education Agency, Adult and Community Education Program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 290 004)

Simich-Dudgeon, C. (1987). Involving limited English proficient parents in their children's education. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin, 10*(2): 3-4, 6-7.

Trinity College. (1986). *Issues of parent involvement and literacy: Proceedings of the symposium held at Trinity College. Executive summary.* Washington, DC: Trinity College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 206)

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1989). Language, literacy and the older refugee in America: Research agenda for the 90's. *College ESL, 1*(1). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 313 298)

Citations with an ED number may be obtained from the
ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS)
7420 Fullereton Rd., Suite 110
Springfield, VA 22153-2852
(703) 440-1400, (800) 443-ERIC
FAX (703) 440-1408.

The National Clearinghouse on Literacy Education for Limited-English-Proficient Adults (NCLE) is operated by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. RI 89166001. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or ED.

For a list of other free NCLE publications on adult ESL literacy, write or call us at the address below.